corresponds to a geometric model of an existing object in the scene and the simulated space is a simulation of the replacement of the existing object with the object represented by the object representation.

REMARKS

Claims 13-26, 28-48, and 51-61 are pending in this patent application. Claims #17, #26, #42, #51, #52, #53, #54, #55, #56 and # 57 have been amended to more distinctively claim Applicant's invention, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 17, 51-56 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(Remark/Amendment...)

With respect to claim 17 the Examiner stated that "the provided images" lacks clear antecedent basis. It is not clear what "provided images" are being referred to. Claim 17 has been amended to replace "the provided images" with "an images of the space" to clarify the reference.

With respect to claim 51-56 the Examiner stated that the scope of claims is unclear. Claim 51 is drawn to an "application". An application is taken to mean a software program, as is known in the art. However, the claims recite various structural elements, such as "means," "systems," "storage," etc., which are more appropriate for an

apparatus or system. Claims 51-56 have been amended to clarify their scope. The applicant has replaced the "application" with "system" as suggested by the examiner.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 13-26, 28-48 and 51-61 under 35 U.S. C. §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent 6, 331, 858 ("Fisher") and U.S. Patent 6, 333, 749 ("Reinhardt"). ....

The Examiner states as to claim 13, Fisher discloses a method for generating remote presentations of products in situ for a user comprising the steps of:

a) prompting the user to provide a representation of the space in which a product is to be viewed in context

b) accepting a product representation representing a product for which a three dimensional geometric model exists or can be created

e) accepting an input of a product location, the product location being a location in the space where the product is to be displayed in situ

g) forming an image of the space where the modified image has been modified to show the identified product in situ in the image with proper proportion and perspective

Fisher does not disclose acquiring a digital image of the space, or the steps of c), d), f) and g) (as claimed). However, in an analogous environment Reinhardt discloses:

acquiring a digital image of a space

c) determining at least one dimension reference, wherein a dimension reference is the measurement of a distance in the space corresponding to a separation of two points on the digital image

d) calculating, from the image, the at least one dimension reference and reference information, camera parameters for a camera in the space from which the image was captured, wherein the camera parameters include at least a camera position and a focal length

f) transforming the geometric model of a product based on at least the camera position and the product location to form a transformed geometric model

g) combining the transformed geometric model and the digital image to form a modified image of the space

Reinhardt's technique would provide more realistic images of the space containing the products in situ, therefore it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to modify Fisher's invention according to Reinhardt.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiners assessment that the method described in claim 13 is obvious over the combination of "Fisher " and Reinhardt". The Examiner states that Reinhardt's "environment" or context of Reinhardt's invention is "analogous" to that of Fisher. Fisher, however, teaches about an interface for combining 3D scenes with items (e.g. surface finishes, 3D objects) not of the scene (i.e. products in situ). Reinhart does not teach this. Reinhart teaches about modeling - how to transform discrete geometric modeling primitives to model objects depicted in a scene, of the scene, or in the limit the scene itself.

The Examiner suggests the following attribution of the steps of the present inventions as a combination of Fisher and Reinhardt. According to the Examiner the attribution is as follows:

a) prompting the user to provide a representation of the space in which a product is to be viewed in context (Fisher)

b) accepting a product representation representing a product for which a three dimensional geometric model exists or can be created (Fisher)

e) accepting an input of a product location, the product location being a location in the space where the product is to be displayed in situ (Fisher)

g) forming an image of the space where the modified image has been modified to show the identified product in situ in the image with proper proportion and perspective (Fisher)

c) determining at least one dimension reference, wherein a dimension reference is the measurement of a distance in the space corresponding to a separation of two points on the digital image (Reinhardt)

d) calculating, from the image, the at least one dimension reference and reference information, camera parameters for a camera in the space from which the image was captured, wherein the camera parameters include at least a camera position and a focal length (Reinhardt)

f) transforming the geometric model of a product based on at least the camera position and the product location to form a transformed geometric model (Reinhardt)

g) combining the transformed geometric model and the digital image to form a modified image of the space (Reinhardt)

However, there is nothing in Reinhart regarding step f) of claim 13. The Examiner's cited references for Reinhardt (column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 4; column 7, lines 62-65) pertain to steps c) and d) of claim 13.

09/748,052

(column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 4); "...constructing a three-dimensional model on top of one or more images (e.g., photographs) such that the model's parameters automatically match those of the real world object depicted in the photograph(s)" (column 7, lines 62-65) "To accomplish these objectives, as the user manipulates the wireframe renderings 202 of the primitives to align the wireframe with the underlaid image 201, constraints are added to "fix" the wireframe 202 to the image 201."

These references are steps per Reinhardt's modeling technique of interactive wireframe and constraints manipulation, that result in fitting parameterized geometric primitive(s) to an object or objects depicted in an image, and further resulting in the derivation of geometry and camera parameters to establish that fit. This does not pertain to step f) of claim 13 of the present invention. Step f) of the present invention is a technique for taking derived parameters (such as camera parameters) from step c) and d) of claim 13 and utilizing them to transform objects, and in the present embodiment, objects not of the scene (i.e. "products"), into the scene. This step is not a parametric fitting technique like steps c) and d).

The step f) in claim 13 is not taught by Fisher either. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious by combination of the referenced prior art.

Furthermore, the technique of step c) and d) of claim 13 are different than taught by Reinhardt. Reinhardt's invention and the present invention are similar in that both synthesize camera parameters for the image(s) of the subject scene, but the interface and process by which they accomplish this is markedly different.

The technique of the present invention is that referred to in the specification as the Phantom Cursor or PC (See pp 29, line 4). This novel technique is an apparatus and

09/748,052

process for acquiring a 3-space camera solution relative to any planar facet of a scene or object depicted in a 2D image. Unlike Reinhardt, the user is not required to identify and select primitives to be placed and constrained (e.g. "pinned") to objects in the scene. This is a markedly different paradigm for the user because the user is not explicitly modeling the scene. Further, in the present invention objects (unlike Reinhardt's primitives) are not required to be explicitly constrained to an exact location in the scene bounded by the constraints placed on the scene.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 14, Fisher discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the step of accepting a product representation comprises the steps of : prompting the user to identify a product of interest from a set of products (column 2, lines 60-61; column 5, lines 46-50; allowing the user to select implies prompting of the user); searching a collection of product representations to locate a member of the collection that matches the product identified by the user (column 2, lines 60-61; selection of one of a plurality of products implies that a collection of such products is searched and located, and matches that identified by the user); and accepting the matching product representation (column 2, lines 63-64; column 5, lines 48-51). Claim 14 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13.

The Examiner states regarding claim 15, repeating steps b), e), and f) for second and subsequent selected products would have been an obvious extension of the Fisher Reinhardt method. Note that to only perform the steps for one product would defeat the purpose of the invention , and would make the invention essentially useless for retail transactions over the internet. Claim 15 is dependent on claim 14 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 14.

09/748,052

The Examiner states as to claim 16, Fisher teaches prompting the user to acquire a three-dimensional geometric model for a product of interest to the user (column 5, lines 65-66; column 6, line 7). In combining Fisher and Reinhardt as discussed above with regard to claim 1, a three-dimensional geometric model would be acquired (e.g. see Reinhardt, column 4, line 1). Claim 16 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13.

The Examiner states regarding claim 17, repeating step a) for second and subsequent images of the space and using each of the provided images would have been an obvious extension to the combined Fisher Reinhardt method. Keeping in mind that Fisher allows different viewpoints of the space (column 2, lines 11-13), to only perform the step for one product would defeat the purpose of the invention, and would make the invention essentially useless for retail transactions over the Internet. Claim 17 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 18, Fisher as modified by Reinhardt discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the modified image of the space is a two-dimensional view of a three-dimensional geometric model (note Fishers column 1, lines 44-45; and the 3D model taught by Reinhardt), the method further comprising a step of moving a camera position of the modified image of the space to simulate moving around in the space (e.g. Fisher, column 2, lines 11-13). Claim 18 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 19, Fisher discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the step of prompting the user to identify the product from a set of products is performed using a commerce server that serves product models and further comprising a step of transmitting the digital image to the commerce server 9column 3, line 27). Claim 19 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states as to claim 20, Fisher discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the step of prompting the user to identify the product from a set of products is performed using a commerce application that receives product models and further comprising a step of providing the digital image to the commerce application (column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 2). Claim 20 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 21, Reinhardt further teaches that the camera parameters include camera position, camera rotation (orientation), focal length (abstract, lines 5-6). Reinhardt does not explicitly mention that the camera parameter includes center of projection. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that the camera parameter center of projection is well known. It would have been obvious to calculate this camera parameter because it would provide an enhanced 3D scene. Claim 21 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13

The Examiner states as to claim 22, Reinhardt further teaches that the reference information includes correspondence between two-dimensional image features and three-dimensional structures (column 11, lines 19-25; the points are in the 2D image, distance is taken in 3D). Claim 22 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13. Also, our method of acquiring camera parameters differs from that of Reinhardt.

The Examiner states as to claim 23, Reinhardt further teaches that the step of determining the at least one dimension reference is a step of inputting the at least one dimension reference, wherein a dimension reference is a measurement of a distance in the space corresponding to a separation of two points on the digital image (column 11, lines 19-25). Claim 23 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states as to claim 24, Reinhardt teaches that the step of determining the at least one dimension reference is a step of assuming a default scale and using the default scale to determine the at least one dimension reference (column 11, lines 19-25; the default scale is implied by the ruler distance). Claim 24 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 25, Fisher discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the three-dimensional model for a product is a planar representation of an object and a texture map to be applied to a surface of the object (column 4, lines 39-40).

-24-

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 26, reference is made to the discussion provided above for claims 13 and 19. Specific structure, such as storage, engines etc. are considered inherent in Fisher and Reinhardt, given that they are computer based systems, and any computer programmed to perform the indicated method would provide the required structure. Claim 26 is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13. Also, claim 26 has been amended to describe a commerce server with an aspect unique to this invention to have "a visual reconstruction engine having an input to receive the digital image of the space form from the space image storage, an input to receive camera parameters for the digital image of the space from form the photogrammetric modeling engine, an input to receive one or more product representation for selected products not of the space to be inserted into the space". It is respectfully submitted that claim 26, as amended, is not just any commerce server.

The Examiner states claim 28 is similar to claim 13. The discussion provided above for claim 13 is applicable to 28. Claim 28 is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 29, Fisher discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the product representation includes a texture map associated with the product

(column, lines 13-14, 39-40). Claim 29 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28.

The Examiner states as to claim 30, Fisher is silent with regard to the product representation includes at least a product digital image, captured by a product image capture device positioned to capture a digital image of the product. However, the Examiner contends that the images of the product must be captured using some kind of device. Further, Reinhardt teaches utilizing a digital camera to capture a digital image of objects (column 7 lines 18-19). It would have been obvious to utilize a digital camera as taught by Reinhardt in Fisher's invention because of the convenience provided by digital cameras. Claim 30 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28. Further, Reinhardt uses a camera to acquire an image of the scene. In this invention the applicant acquires images of objects not within the scene. Reinhardt does not teach this in his invention. Further, we respectfully disagree with the Examiner; images of products do not have to be captured using some device. For example surface finishes used by Fisher can be images created by well known techniques such as procedural texture mapping; whereby, for example a wood grain finish is generated by computer algorithm.

The Examiner states as to claim 31, Reinhardt further teaches that the product representation includes a capture position, capture angle of rotation and focal length (abstract lines 5-7; note that these parameters are derived from the images, implying the representation includes them). Claim 31 is dependent on claim 30 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 30.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 32, Reinhardt further teaches that the product representation includes product image capture parameters including at least a representation of the position of the product image capture device when the digital image of the product was captured (abstract, lines 5-7; note that these parameters are derived from images, implying that the representation includes them). Claim 32 is patentable since the "product" that Reinhardt discusses is the object in the scene while the "product" being referred to in this claim is an object that is not present in the scene but needs to be transformed by the camera and integrated into the scene.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 33, Reinhardt teaches that the product image capture parameters include projections of geometric elements from the product onto the product digital image (column 5, lines 25-28). Claim 33 is dependent on claim 32 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 32.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 34, Reinhardt teaches the capture parameters for the image of the scene include projections of geometric elements from the scene onto the scene digital image (column 5, lines 28-29). Claim 34 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28.

The Examiner states as to claim 35, Reinhardt further teaches the capture parameters for the image of the scene include an angle of rotation for the image capture device in the space (abstract, lines 5-7). Claim 35 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28.

The Examiner states as to claim 36, Fisher, as modified by Reinhardt, discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the step of inputting a product representation is preceded by the steps of: capturing a product digital image using the product image capture device

-27-

note as above, Reinhardt provides for the product image capture device); and calculating, from the product digital image, product image capture parameters that include at least a representation of the product image capture position and a representation of the product image capture focal length (note as above, Reinhardt teaches this e.g., in the abstract, lines 5-7). Claim 36 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28.

The Examiner states as to claim 37, Reinhardt further teaches that the step of transforming results in the one or more transformed digital image sharing common capture parameters, the common capture parameters including at least a capture position (column 11, lines 1-7; column 12, lines 12-14). Claim 37 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28. Further, Reinhardt is using the camera to transform a primitive to model a real world object within the scene whereas in the present invention the camera at this step is transforming the image of a real world object initially outside the scene.

The Examiner states as to claim 38, Fisher discloses the method of claim 28, further comprising a step of prompting the user to identify the product from a set of products for which a three-dimensional geometric model exists or can be created (column 2, lines 60-61; column 5, lines 46-50; allowing the user to select implies prompting of the user). Claim 38 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28.

The Examiner states as to claim 39, see the discussion above for claim 23. The argument used for claim 23 apply here. Claim 23 is dependent on claim 13 and is

-28-

patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 13. Further, since neither Fisher nor Reinhardt teach step f) of claim 13 so they do not teach claim 13.

The Examiner states as to claim 40, repeating the step of combining would have been an obvious extension of the combined Fisher-Reinhardt method. To only perform the step for one product would defeat the purpose of the invention, and would make the invention essentially useless for retail transactions over the Internet. Claim 40 is dependent on claim 28 and is patentable for the same reasons described above for claim 28.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 41, see the remarks above for step d) of claim 13. Claim 41 is dependent on claim 28 and patentable for the same reasons. Also, Step d) of claim 13 uses a very different (see pp 29 line 4 phantom cursor) mechanism than that used by Reinhardt. In the present invention the "product digital image" used for calculating the "product image capture parameters" refers to an image of a product not in the scene and to be inserted into the scene. In Reinhardt's invention the "digital image" used for calculating the "product image capture parameters" is the scene itself.

The Examiner states as to claim 42, Fisher discloses a method for generating a combined image that simulates a product being positioned at a location where a consumer is considering placing the product, without physically placing the product at the location, the method comprising the steps of: a) prompting the consumer to acquire a digital image of the location (column 2, lines 47-50; column 5, lines 45-46); b) generating a location representation of the location (column 2, lines 47-50; column 5, lines 45-46) and geometric elements representing items at the location visible in the digital image of the location (column 5, lines 48-50); c) prompting the consumer to select a product from

-29-

among a plurality of products(column 2, lines 60-61; column 5, lines 46-50; allowing the user to select implies prompting of the user); d) retrieving a product representation for a selected product (column 5, lines 46-50). Fisher does not disclose acquiring a digital image of the location, generating geometric elements representing items at the location visible in the digital image of the location, and that the product representation includes at least a digital image of the product and a representation of the position of a product image capture device when the digital image of the product was captured. However, in an analogous environment Reinhardt discloses: acquiring a digital image of a location (column 4, lines 1-2; column 5 lines 5-8); generating geometric elements representing items at a location visible in the digital image of the location (column 5, lines 25-28); Product (object) representation includes at least a digital image of the product and a representation of the position of a product image capture device when the digital image of the product was captured (abstract, lines 5-7). Reinhardt's techniques would provide more realistic images of the space containing the products, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the modify Fishers invention according to Reinhardt. Claim 42 step d) has been amended to make its characteristics more explicit "wherein the product representation includes at least a digital image of the product that is not present in the location and that will be subsequently inserted into the location". It is patentable because in Reinhardt the position of the camera is with respect to the scene and the digital image is of the scene per step a) of claim 42. In the present invention the camera information referred to in step d) of claim 42 is for a product (object) that is not present in the scene that will be subsequently inserted into the scene.

-30-

The Examiner states as to claim 43, Reinhardt further teaches that the location representation includes location capture parameters of a location capture device, wherein the location capture parameters include at least a representation of a position of the location capture device (abstract, lines 5-7). Claim 43 is dependent on claim 42 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 42.

The Examiner states as to claim 44, Fisher discloses the method of claim 42, further comprising the step of: e) prompting the consumer to indicate where, at the location, the product is to be considered (column 5, lines 44-50); Fisher as modified by Reinhardt teaches f) combining the location representation and the product representation after transforming at least one of the representation to form the combined image showing the product in situ with a proper proportion and perspective (Reinhardt column 5, lines 25-27). Claim 44 is dependent on claim 42 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 42.

The Examiner states as to claim 45, Fisher discloses that the product representations are 3D (column 5 lines 65-66) and a texture map (column 4, lines 13-14). Fisher does not disclose that the product representation includes at least a three dimensional geometric model. Reinhardt teaches using three-dimensional models for objects (e.g. see abstract, line 5; lines 25-28). Given that Fishers objects are 3D, it would have been obvious to utilize three-dimensional geometric models as taught by Reinhardt because this would simplify and speed up rendering. Claim 45 is dependent on claim 42 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 42.

The Examiner states as to claim 46, fisher combined with Reinhardt discloses the method of claim 42, wherein the method is performed by a commerce server (column 3,

lines 27-30) the method further comprising the steps of: e) sending a commerce

application form the commerce server to the consumer computer (Fisher: column 5, line

63 to column 6, line 5); f) executing the commerce application on the consumer

computer, wherein the commerce application performs steps a) and c) (Fisher: column 6,

lines 2-3);

  i) using the commerce application to model geometric elements visible in the

    digital image of the location (this would occur in the combined Fisher

    Reinhardt method) ; and

  j) generating capture parameters for the digital image of the location from the

    geometric elements using the commerce application, the capture parameters

    including a capture location and a focal length (Reinhardt: abstract, lines 5-7).

Claim 46 is dependent on claim 42 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 42.

  The Examiner states as to claim 47, Fisher discloses the method of claim 42,

wherein the method is performed by a commerce server and a consumer computer and

wherein the step of retrieving the product representations in a step of retrieving the

product representations from the commerce server (column 3, lines 28-30; the server

holds the product representations). Claim 47 is dependent on claim 42 and is patentable

for the same reasons as claim 42.

  The Examiner states as to claim 48, Fisher discloses the method of claim 42,

wherein the method is performed by a commerce server and a consumer computer and

wherein the step of retrieving the product representations from a product representation

server (column 28-30, the web server is a product representation server). Claim 48 is dependent on claim 42 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 42.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 51, reference is made to the remarks provided above for 13, 19 and 26. For claim 51 reference is made to the responses provided by the applicant for 13, 19 and 26.

The Examiner states as to claim 52, remarks analogous to those provided above for claim 14. The applicant respectfully submits that the claim 52 is dependent on claim 51 and patentable for the same reasons. Further, it is patentable for the reasons provided for claim 14.

The Examiner states with regards to claims 53-56, having the various components in either the server or the client is seen as a decision based upon designer preference. A designer would have a particular component in either the client or the server based on his or her needs for the given application. This is not considered a patentable difference from the prior art. Claims 53-56 are dependent on claim 51 and are patentable for the same reasons that claim 51 is patentable.

The Examiner states as to claim 57, Fisher discloses a method of generating an image of a simulate space, wherein the space is simulated in that it shows an object placed in a scene, where the object is a physical object and the scene is a physical location, the method comprising the steps of: acquiring one or more images of the scene, wherein the scene does not contain, at the time of acquisition, the object at a desired object location in the scene (column 2, 47-50); acquiring an object representation of the object that is to be simulated in the scene, where the object representation is at least an image of the object (column 5, lines 43, 48-49) combining the scene representation and

-33-

the object representation to form the image of the simulated space (column 5, lines 48-49). Fisher does not disclose that the representation of the scene is an image, or the generating step. However, Reinhardt teaches acquiring an image of a scene (column 4, lines 1-2; column 5, lines 5-8) and generating a scene representation that includes a model of an image acquisition device that captured at least one of the one or more scene images acquired in the step of acquiring one or more images of the scene, the model including at least a representation of a position of the image acquisition device in a space containing the at least scene image when the at least one scene image was captured (abstract, lines 5-7); Claim 57 has been amended to recite more explicitly the method by which the image of the object to be inserted into the location is transformed by the camera.

The Examiner states as to claim 58, Reinhardt teaches that the image is taken form an image capture device. Claim 58 is dependent on amended claim 57 and is patentable for the same reasons that the amended claim 57 is patentable.

The Examiner states as to claim 59, Fisher further discloses the method of claim 57, wherein the object representation includes a texture map (column 4, lines 13-14). Claim 59 is dependent on claim 57 and it is patentable for the same reasons as claim 57.

The Examiner states as to claim 60 Fisher discloses the method of claim 57, further comprising a step of obscuring a portion of the scene with the object where the object representation is constrained such that the positioning or size of the object image is dependent on the positioning or size of an object present in the scene (e.g. see Fig. 3, element 302). Claim 60 is dependent on claim 57 and patentable for the same reason.

The Examiner states with regard to claim 61, reference is made to the discussion provided for 44 and 45. Claim 61 is dependent of claim 57 and is patent for the same reasons as claim 57 and because claims 44 and 45 are patentable.

CONCLUSION

Claims #13-26, #28-48, and #51-61 are pending in this application. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted by Applicant that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. If the Examiner's action is other than allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis S. Fernandez
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,160

Date: _____

Address: Fernandez & Associates, LLP
             Patent Attorneys
             1047 El Camino Real
             Menlo Park, CA 94025

Phone: (650) 325-4999
Fax: (650) 325-1203
Email: _iploft@iploft.com_